

REMARKS

Request for Reconsideration, Informal Matters, Claims Pending

The application stands subject to a final Office action mailed on 4 November 2008. Reconsideration of the claimed invention in view of any amendments above and the discussion below is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 was amended to properly reference the "broadcast/multicast service identity" of antecedent Claim 13. Claim 21 was amended to depend from independent Claim 18, rather than Claim 17, which constitutes part of a different claim set.

The amendment should be entered because they raise no new issues and place the application in better form for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1, 2-9 and 13-21 are pending.

Arguments re: Balachandran & Sinnarajah

Rejection Summary

Claims 1-4, 7-14 & 17-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0054331 (Balachandran) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,636 (Sinnarajah).

Applicants' maintain their position relative to the prior art cited previously.

Discussion of Claim 1

Regarding Claim 1, Balachandran and Sinnarajah fail to suggest a

... method in a wireless broadcast/multicast service subscriber device, the method comprising:

obtaining broadcast/multicast service identification information;
determining a paging slot to monitor based on the broadcast/multicast service identification information;

obtaining broadcast/multicast service information based on information obtained by monitoring the paging slot.

At paragraph [0028], Balachandran discusses sending a system overhead message, i.e., a Broadcast Service Parameter Message (BPSM), on a paging or control channel. At paragraph [0034], Balachandran indicates that the BPSM includes data for channels that carry BCMCS content, channel configuration, and content identifiers among other information. The Examiner concedes that Balachandran fails to disclose determining the paging slot to monitor "...based on the broadcast/multicast service identification information..." as in Claim 1.

The Examiner's reliance on Sinnarajah to meet the deficiencies of Balachandran is erroneous. At col. 12, line 37-col. 13, line 20, Sinnarajah discloses a subscriber that determines which slot to monitor based on a mapping (e.g., hash) function based on a Group_ID to which the subscriber belongs and multicast paging cycle (MPCY) input parameters. Alternatively, Sinnarajah maps the Group-ID to the slot number. Thus Sinnarajah does not determine the paging slot to monitor "...based on the broadcast/multicast service identification information..." as in Claim 1. Claim 1 is thus patentably distinguished over Balachandran and Sinnarajah.

Discussion of Claim 13

Regarding Claim 13, Balachandran and Sinnarajah fail to suggest a

... method in a wireless communications network providing broadcast/multicast services, the method comprising:
determining a paging slot;
sending a broadcast/multicast service identity to subscribers of a corresponding broadcast/multicast service,
the broadcast/multicast service identity identifying the determined paging slot;
sending broadcast/multicast service information on the determined paging slot.

At paragraph 0028, Balachandran discusses sending a system overhead message, i.e., a Broadcast Service Parameter Message (BPSM), on a paging or control channel. At paragraph 0034, Balachandran indicates that the BPSM includes data for channels that carry BCMCS content, channel configuration, and content identifiers among other information. The Examiner concedes that Balachandran does not disclose "... sending a broadcast/multicast service identity to subscribers of a corresponding broadcast/multicast service [wherein] the broadcast/multicast service identity identifying the determined paging slot" as in Claim 13.

The Examiner's reliance on Sinnarajah to meet the deficiencies of Balachandran is erroneous. At col. 12, line 37-col. 13, line 20, Sinnarajah discloses a subscriber that determines which slot to monitor based on a mapping (e.g., hash) function based on a Group_ID to which the subscriber belongs and multicast paging cycle (MPCY) input parameters. Alternatively, Sinnarajah maps the Group-ID to the slot number. Thus Sinnarajah does not disclose a "... the broadcast/multicast service identity identifying the

determined paging slot" as in Claim 13. Claim 13 is thus patentably distinguished over Balachandran and Sinnarajah.

Discussion of Claim 18

Regarding Claim 18, Balachandran and Sinnarajah fail to suggest

a

... method in a wireless communications network providing broadcast/multicast services, the method comprising:

 dynamically selecting a paging slot for communicating broadcast/multicast subscriber information;

 communicating broadcast/multicast identification information corresponding to the slot on which broadcast/multicast subscriber information may be obtained by a broadcast/multicast service subscriber device,

 communicating broadcast/multicast service information on the paging slot selected.

The Examiner concedes that Balachandran does not disclose "...communicating broadcast/multicast service identification information corresponding to the slot on which broadcast/multicast subscriber information may be obtained...." The Examiner's reliance on Sinnarajah to meet the admitted deficiencies of Balachandran however is erroneous. At col. 12, line 37-col. 13, line 20, Sinnarajah discloses a subscriber that determines which slot to monitor based on a mapping (e.g., hash) function based on a Group_ID to which the subscriber belongs and multicast paging cycle (MPCY) input parameters. Alternatively, Sinnarajah maps the Group-ID to the slot number. Thus Sinnarajah does not disclose "...communicating broadcast/multicast service identification information corresponding to the slot on which broadcast/multicast subscriber information may be obtained...."

ZHU ET AL.
"Broadcast/Multicast Services
In Communication Networks"
Atty. Docket No. CS23259RL

Appl. No. 10/748,032
Confirm No. 6749
Examiner K. Ferguson
Art Unit 2617

as in Claim 18. Claim 18 is thus patentably distinguished over Balachandran and Sinnarajah.

Prayer For Relief

In view of any amendments and the discussion above, the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

/ ROLAND K BOWLER II /

MOTOROLA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (RKB)
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, W4-37Q
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

ROLAND K. BOWLER II 18 Nov. 2008
REG. NO. 33,477

TELEPHONE NO. (847) 523-3978
FACSIMILE NO. (847) 523-2350